

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF OCTOBER 10, 2005**

**2005-0830** - Appeal of a decision by the Director of the Planning Division for a project located at **1156 Aster Avenue** (near E. Evelyn Avenue) to modify the Special Development Permit approval requiring slate roof material to allow for 50-year Dimensional Composition Material (APN: 213-01-026) KD

**Kelly Diekmann**, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff is supporting the change from a slate roof to an alternative roof material choice. The applicant made a good point that the architecture does not support featuring an expensive or high-aesthetic roof as part of the architecture.

**Chair Hungerford opened the public hearing.**

**Peter Petruzzi**, architect representing the owner, said that the original approval of a "slate" roof was a clerical misinterpretation when what was actually being proposed was a composition tile slate (color) roof. Somehow by the end of the original hearing, what was approved was a slate (material) roof. He commented that there are several issues related to slate material roofs that would require increasing some of the structural aspects of this project and cause an increase to the sale price as slate is more expensive. The slate material roof is generally for larger more stately projects and would be less appropriate for the cottage, craftsman style architecture. The applicant is offering an improved dimensional tile roof which is above the minimum City requirement. The dimensional tile roofs provide more pattern and character and are a good material for the shallow sloping roofs of this project.

**Comm. Simons** commented that the "clerical error" at the original hearing ended up in him making a motion for a slate roof. He asked if there had been any other roof materials being considered for this project. Mr. Petruzzi said they had always proposed a compositional roof and it somehow developed into slate material roof in the original meeting.

**Chair Hungerford closed the public hearing.**

**Comm. Simons** made a motion to grant the appeal as requested by the applicant. **Comm. Klein** seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0 with **Comm. Moylan** absent.

**ACTION:** Comm. Simons made a motion on item 2005-0830 to grant the appeal as requested by the applicant. Comm. Klein seconded. Motion carried 6-0, Comm. Moylan absent.

**APPEAL OPTION:** This decision of the Planning Commission is final.